

They are most excellent. There is undoubtedly a great loss of life from this cause. But are not the ways of Providence sometimes called divine? Is not the elimination of the "4th of July idiot" providential? Ought we to be so temeritous as to try to alter the ways of Divine Providence? And even if it were possible to do away with the toy pistol, would not satanic ingenuity invent some other appliance for the immediate necessity of the fool killer? We long since developed sufficient Christian resignation to look forward with sorrowful regret to the indefinite continuance of the nerve-racking license of the 4th-of-July idiot. When the Toy Pistol article was published some glimmering hope was awakened; statistics seemed to show the activity of the fool-killer. But no; he must be squelched; we must still endure.

The title "doctor" was originally used to signify teacher in general, but in about the 12th century it became a title of honor for the learned, irrespective of teaching. In the 15th century a difference was observed between the professions of medicine and law, and theology and philosophy, the title "doctor" being bestowed upon the two first and "master" upon the others. In modern times "master" has practically disappeared. The title "doctor" when given an M. D., Phar.D., or D. D. S., is, as a rule, respected by most people; but, unfortunately, in this day of easily acquired titles, there is danger of the ancient and cherished title of doctor losing much of its distinction. It may be a debatable question as to whether there are too many doctors of medicine, but there is no denying the fact that there are too many doctors of everything else. In the plenitude of these the graduate in medicine is liable to become a "doc", the title worthily bestowed on many whose right to any title whatsoever is largely a matter of assumption. There is no more reason why a physician should be addressed as "doc" than that a master should be dubbed "mas", or a professor "prof". A physician who is habitually addressed as "doc" lacks one of two qualities—dignity or self-respect.

The corporation known as the "Eddyite Book Concern", or, with fine disregard of truth, the "Church of Christ, Scientist" (?), alias the Rev. Mrs. Dr. Mary Baker **EDDYITE THIRST.** Glover-Patterson-Eddy, alias "Mother Mary", is not fettered and trammelled with any particular regard for the fitness of things. Naturally, the alleged intellects of those who can say that they believe such stuff as

that "food neither strengthens nor weakens the body" could not be expected to have any particular reasoning quality. The inconsistency of several thousands of such idiots journeying to Boston to see "Mother Mary"—when they know from her own book (which has no substantial existence except the three-fifty it costs) that she herself cannot have any material existence, and that they themselves are only figments of the imagination, and consequently could as well *think* themselves in Boston as actually go there—is only to be expected. It is also not surprising that they should fail to appreciate the insult paid the prophetess when they were so inconsiderate and "unscientific" as to develop a thirst. How can a thought be thirsty and need the application of ice-water? But then—the word has been said; there needs must be always a certain number of fools; one is "born every minute".

The JOURNAL publishes this month an exceedingly interesting document. It is a circular or leaflet of instruction to school teachers concerning the importance of, and the method to be used in, examining the eyesight of school children. This leaflet has been prepared by the Superintendent of Schools, of Los Angeles, corrected and approved by the President of the Board of Education of that city, who, by the way, is the President of our State Society. To the best of our knowledge and belief, this is the first document of its class prepared by a school board in conjunction with a competent specialist for the specific purpose of being used officially in schools and studied by school teachers. It should receive the careful attention of every physician, and particularly of those who are interested in this question of the examination of school children's eyes. Certainly no more important question in school hygiene or in the physical and mental development of school children, can be urged. Ventilation, sufficient space, illumination, etc., and all questions of general sanitation are now matters of routine consideration by the architect and the school board. But the eyes of the pupil—upon which depend, one may say, the whole future life of the individual—must be considered by the specialist, or first by the teacher under instructions from the specialist.

THE NEW CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS.

On page 417 will be found the first installment of the proposed new constitution and by-laws, recommended by the special committee of five on that subject, appointed under a resolution passed by the House of Delegates at the last meeting of the State Society. The committee waited several months for one of its members,